

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 16 2007

Serial No. 10/730,759
60426-830 PUS1REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed remarks and analysis and requests reconsideration of the final rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 15, 16, 26 and 32-34 were rejected as being anticipated by Steen (U.S. 4,139,790). Claims 15 and 26 require a plurality of slots separated from each other by at least a portion of a lamination layer. This limitation is not shown as the various slots in Steen are interconnected. Further this requires that the slots are separated by a portion of a lamination layer. Steen only discloses separation by material filled into the slots themselves. Claims 15 and 26 requires that the plurality of slots are separated from each other, Steen simply does not disclose this feature as the slots as read by the Examiner are one continuous slot, and are not separated by a portion of a lamination layer. Further, the necked down area of the slots between the permanent magnets does not separate the slots from each other as is required by the claims.

Further, claim 15 and 26 require a bulbous shaped end portion disposed on each side of a central portion, for claim 15, and internal slot for claim 26. As the read slots are a single continuous slot, the portions between magnets in the slots are not end portions. As appreciated, the claims are broadly read, however, an interpretation cannot be counter to what a worker skilled in the art would recognize. In this case, reading the filled in areas of 117 as ends even though it is simple an intermediate part of the slot cannot be supported and is counter to what one skilled in the art would recognize that term to mean. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the claims include limitations that are not disclosed by Steen.

The Examiner argues that Applicant is arguing features not in the claims. However, as Applicant has pointed out, the claims require the slots separated from each other by at least a portion of a lamination layer. This limitation is present in both claims 15 and 26 and define over the disclosures of Steen. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 39-44 were rejected as being anticipated by Gary (U.S. 6,946,766). Claims 39 and 42 each require bulbous shaped end portions. The Examiner has stated that the curved or rounded end disclosed in Gary meet this limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees. A simple rounded end is not bulbous as the shape. As appreciated, the Examiner is required to broadly interpret the claims, however the term bulbous refers to a very specific shape. Further, an

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/730,759
60426-830 PUS1

interpretation by the Examiner cannot be contrary to what would be recognized to those skilled in the art. In this instance, the term bulbous requires more than a simple rounded cavity. Instead, the term requires an enlarged rounded part. This is disclosed in the drawings provided with the originally filed application. The rounded end shape disclosed in Gary is not enlarged, but instead merely rounds off the ends.

Claims 2-6, 8; 9, 11, 14, 15, 26-31 & 35-38 were rejected as being obvious over Kliman (U.S. 5,159,220) in view of Steen. This rejection is not proper as it is not supported by the requisite suggestion and motivation as the two references teach away from each other and in fact would destroy an intended operation of the base reference. (Kliman).

Kliman has as a stated purpose to provide a "W" shaped orientation with the permanent magnet to s.(Kliman, Col 2, lines 34-38). Steen on the other hand provides a plurality of conductor bars 33 that form part of a squirrel cage winding that includes end rings 34. Part of the operation of the Kliman device relies on the "W" configuration of each pole extending near the rotor periphery, leaving only a thin bridge to carry hoop stress. This provides the effect of introducing a "flux barrier" that makes the disclosed motor operate more like a surface magnet motor. In Steen the conductor bars 33 are disposed about the rotor periphery and therefore would not allow this function in the Kliman device, in effect destroying an desired and intended operation of the Kliman motor. There can be no suggestion and motivation if the proposed combination cannot destroy an intended operation of the base reference (Kliman). For this reason the rejection cannot be supported by the required suggestion and motivation. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Further, claims 8, 15, 26 and 35 all require a bulbous structure at an end of each magnetic slot. As discussed above, a bulbous structure requires more than a simple curved portion as part of a substantially triangular part or cavity. Kliman and Steen merely disclose cavities at the end of rectangular slots that have some rounded portion, nothing that would meet the requirement of a bulbous structure. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson,

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 16 2007

Serial No. 10/730,759
60426-830 PUS1

Gaskey & Olds \$120.00 for the one month extension fee. Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,



John M. Siragusa No. 46,174
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: March 16, 2007